

with school age children. As I indicate, it is our opinion that this last group should not be expected to be active participants in the work force, although we recognize that the recent action by the Congress in enacting the welfare amendments indicate a contrary view.

Another aspect of the problem is that while income alone can assist many in raising their living standards and providing necessities for themselves and their families, there is a wide range of supportive services which many citizens need. Job counseling, guidance training, education are but a few of such services which are fundamental if we are to be successful in meeting the needs and enabling all people, particularly poorer people, to become full-fledged members of our society.

It is because of these varying conditions that I believe that much of the emphasis which takes place in most discussions of income maintenance programs has too narrow a focus. I think to a great extent this was evidenced by the discussions before this subcommittee over the past couple of weeks which have centered on the welfare system, what to do about reforming the welfare system or what to do about replacing the welfare system.

While I believe there has to be and there will be either a welfare system or some final system, whether it is a welfare system, a negative income tax, or some new system which will sort of be a catchall to assure a basic minimum income, it is important to understand that the cost of any such system depends on, and can and should be reduced by, other measures which must be taken. These include: a program to provide adequately paid jobs to all who can and should work; an adequate system of replacement income through the proven mechanism of social insurance for those who are no longer able to work; an adequate network of educational and health measures. I would also emphasize adequate legal protection for those who are vulnerable to discrimination and exploitation.

As I point out in my paper, it is our opinion that the highest priority on this agenda of social action should be a commitment by our Government to a full employment economy with adequate rates of growth and the creation of jobs by Government whenever necessary to achieve that goal. There should be an assurance by Government of jobs for people at decent rates of pay.

I emphasize decent rates of pay because an examination of the persons in poverty indicate that about a quarter are persons in families where the head of the family works full time, all year round, but the job still leaves the family in poverty. A total of one and a half million men under age 65 work the year round and in their families are 8 million persons. In addition, there are some 300,000 women, also under the age of 65, who have worked from 50 to 52 weeks a year on a full-week schedule, but because of inadequate wages they and their families have not been able to rise above the poverty line.

Of course, there are also in the working group people who do not have the opportunity to work full time and their poverty is due both to a combination of lack of work for part of the year and inadequate wages.

Even with the increase in minimum wages resulting from the recent legislation, many of these workers will still remain poor. As I point out, it is our view that broader coverage and higher standards of min-